REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27. Claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 25-27 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted. Arguments presented in the Response filed on August 29, 2007 are incorporated herein. The rejections are traversed below.

Thus, claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

*** ***

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned, if further clarification is necessary, in order to expedite prosecution of the application.

*** ***

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,336 (Ladd) and U.S. Patent No. 6,801,604 (Maes) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,535 (Hedin).

The Examiner alleges that Hedin teaches "transferring control over user interaction" from the portal to the second speech recognizer independent of the portal, for example, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner indicates that Hedin teaches transferring in the instance that the system needs to transfer when a larger recognition vocabulary is required.

Hedin fails to teach or suggest "transferring control over user interaction to the second speech recognizer independent of the portal including executing speech recognition at the second speech recognizer using the augmenting grammar set", as recited in amended claim 1.

Per the Examiner's own assertion, Hedin discusses a system where if the recognizer of the terminal doesn't recognize a word, the audio is sent to the more powerful remote recognizer. That is, the terminal in Hedin only forwards the unrecognized audio to the more powerful ASR and does not provide "control over user interaction including executing speech recognition using the augmenting grammar set [supplied by the portal]", as recited for example in claim 1. Independent claims 8 and 20 recite similar features.

Ladd does not teach or suggest, "augmenting the speech recognition system by providing an augmenting grammar set supplied by a first speech recognizer of a portal to a second speech recognizer" and "notifying the portal in response to an input which corresponds to the augmenting grammar set", as recited for example in claim 1.

Instead, Ladd only discusses centralized speech processing where changes to the personalities and grammars and speech inputs (calls) from users are all handled or controlled by the electronic network (see, col. 4, lines 32-35). The teachings of Ladd, if the reference is looked at as a whole, are directed to a centralized processing of all speech user inputs based on grammars or vocabulary stored in a database.

The Examiner indicates that one would be motivated to modify Ladd based on Maes because it would be advantageous to temporarily shift more intense speech processing to adequately prepared systems and then returning to the original program (page 3 of Office Action mailed June 21, 2007). Applicants respectfully disagree. Absent use of hindsight, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not be motivated to modify the centralized speech processing of Ladd with remote speech processing for in Maes because there is no discussion in Ladd other than the centralized speech recognition via the ASR unit.

Even assuming the Examiner's reasoning for modifying Ladd with Maes, Maes does not teach or suggest notifying the portal of an input corresponding to the augmenting grammar set "responsive to speech recognition executed via the second speech recognizer independent of the portal" using the grammar set supplied by the portal, as taught by claim 1. Instead, Maes transfers input utterances only when the input requires complex speech recognition (i.e., performance based) (see, col. 4, lines 42-62).

Ladd, Maes and Hedin, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above mentioned features including "transferring control over user interaction including speech recognition using the grammar set" and "transferring" or "returning" control back to the portal when input corresponds the grammar set, as taught by the claimed invention.

As indicated below, the other independent claims also recite at least one of the above-identified patentable features.

In particular, none of the cited references teach or suggest, "**determining an input from a caller matches a grammar set supplied by a portal... during interaction of the caller controlled by an application server** independent of voice recognition by the portal" and

"implementing subsequent voice recognition via the portal by **transferring control over interaction of the caller to the portal responsive to said determining**", as recited in claim 27 (emphasis added).

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "transferring control of the call including user interaction to the remote application server including executing speech recognition at the second speech recognizer using the augmenting grammar set" and "transferring control of the call including the user interaction back to the portal and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal", as recited in claim 17.

Claim 25 also recites, "transferring control over caller interaction to the first speech recognizer of the application server including executing speech recognition at the second speech recognizer using the grammar set" and "switching control of the caller interaction from the application server to the portal."

Independent claim 26 also recites, "transferring a grammar set of a portal to an application server and subsequently transferring control of the call including speech recognition using the grammar set to the application server from the portal", "determining whether the call includes an input corresponding to the transferred grammar set" and "returning control of the call back to the portal."

Claims depending from the independent and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by the cited references.

The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 14, "the application server performs one of a fixed set of pre-determined actions on behalf of the portal in response to a predetermined input which is recognized as corresponding to the augmenting grammar set."

The cited references fail to teach or suggest a recognizer performing "one of a fixed set of pre-determined actions on behalf of the portal in response to a predetermined input which is recognized as corresponding to the augmenting grammar set", as recited in claim 14.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10/31/2007

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501